arXiv:1608.01820v2 [cs.DM] 13 Aug 2016

Bounded Clique-Width of ($S_{1,2,2}$,Triangle)-Free Graphs

Andreas Brandstädt[1] Suhail Mahfud[2] Raffaele Mosca[3]

August 16, 2016

[1] Institut für Informatik, Universität Rostock, D-18051 Rostock, Germany.
ab@informatik.uni-rostock.de

[2] Tishreen University Latakia, Syria.

[3] Dipartimento di Economia, Universitá degli Studi "G. D'Annunzio", Pescara 65121, Italy.
r.mosca@unich.it

Abstract

If a graph has no induced subgraph isomorphic to H_1 or H_2 then it is said to be (H_1, H_2)-free. Dabrowski and Paulusma found 13 open cases for the question whether the clique-width of (H_1, H_2)-free graphs is bounded. One of them is the class of ($S_{1,2,2}$,triangle)-free graphs. In this paper we show that these graphs have bounded clique-width. Thus, also ($P_1 + 2P_2$,triangle)-free graphs have bounded clique-width which solves another open problem of Dabrowski and Paulusma. Meanwhile we were informed by Paulusma that in December 2015, Dabrowski, Dross and Paulusma showed that ($S_{1,2,2}$,triangle)-free graphs (and some other graph classes) have bounded clique-width.

Keywords: Bounded clique-width; $S_{1,2,2}$-free graphs; triangle-free graphs.

1 Introduction

The notion of *clique-width* of a graph, defined by Courcelle, Engelfriet and Rozenberg (in the context of graph grammars) in [2], is a fundamental example of a width parameter on graphs which leads to efficient algorithms for problems expressible in some kind of Monadic Second Order Logic whenever the class of graphs has bounded clique-width [3].

The clique-width $cw(G)$ of a graph G is defined as the minimum number of labels needed to construct G by using the following four operations on vertex-labeled graphs:

(*i*) creating a new vertex v with (integer) label ℓ (denoted by $\ell(v)$).

(*ii*) taking the disjoint union of two (vertex-labeled and vertex-disjoint) graphs G_1, G_2 (denoted by $G_1 \oplus G_2$).

(*iii*) adding all edges between the set of all vertices with label i and the set of all vertices with label j for $i \neq j$ (denoted by $\eta_{i,j}$).

(*iv*) renaming label i to j (denoted by $\rho_{i \to j}$).

A *k-expression* for a graph G of clique-width k describes the recursive generation of G by repeatedly applying these operations $(i) - (iv)$ using at most k pairwise different labels.

See [9] for a survey on clique-width.

Step (iii) is also called *join* between labels i and j, and renaming labels is also called relabeling.

For a subset $M \subset V$, a vertex $z \notin M$ *distinguishes* M if there are $x, y \in M$ with $xz \in E$ and $yz \notin E$. A subset $M \subset V$ is a *module* if for every vertex $v \notin M$, v does not distinguish M. A module M is *trivial* if either $M = \emptyset$, $M = V$ or $|M| = 1$. A nontrivial module is a *homogeneous* set. Obviously, a vertex set H is homogeneous in G if and only if H is homogeneous in the complement graph $\overline{G}$. A graph is *prime* if it does not contain any homogeneous set. In particular, if G is a prime graph then G and $\overline{G}$ are connected.

In [3, 4], various fundamental clique-width properties are shown, among them:

Proposition 1 ([3, 4]) *For a graph G, $cw(G) = \max\{cw(H) : H$ is a prime subgraph of $G\}$.*

Thus we can focus on prime graphs. Moreover, vertex deletion preserves bounded clique-width; more exactly:

Proposition 2 *If $\mathcal{C}$ is a class of bounded clique-width and $\mathcal{C}'$ results from adding a constant number of vertices to all graphs in $\mathcal{C}$ then also $\mathcal{C}'$ has bounded clique-width.*

In [7], Dabrowski and Paulusma analyzed the clique-width of H-free bipartite graphs for any H, and in [6], they analyzed the clique-width of (H_1, H_2)-free graphs and found 13 open cases for the question whether the clique-width of (H_1, H_2)-free graphs is bounded.

Let P_k denote the chordless path P with k vertices, say $a_1, \ldots, a_k$, and $k-1$ edges $a_i a_{i+1}$, $1 \leq i \leq k-1$; we also denote it as $P = (a_1, \ldots, a_k)$. Let C_k denote the chordless cycle with k vertices. K_3 (called *triangle*) is the complete graph with three vertices.

For indices $i, j, k \geq 0$, let $S_{i,j,k}$ denote the graph with vertices $u, x_1, \ldots, x_i$, $y_1, \ldots, y_j$, $z_1, \ldots, z_k$ such that the subgraph induced by $u, x_1, \ldots, x_i$ forms a P_{i+1} $(u, x_1, \ldots, x_i)$, the subgraph induced by $u, y_1, \ldots, y_j$ forms a P_{j+1} $(u, y_1, \ldots, y_j)$, and the subgraph induced by $u, z_1, \ldots, z_k$ forms a P_{k+1} $(u, z_1, \ldots, z_k)$, and there are no other edges in $S_{i,j,k}$. Thus, *claw* is $S_{1,1,1}$, and P_k is isomorphic to e.g. $S_{0,0,k-1}$. $P_1 + 2P_2$ denotes the disjoint union of one vertex and two P_2's. Note that $P_1 + 2P_2$ is an induced subgraph of $S_{1,2,2}$.

One of the open cases in [6] is the class of ($S_{1,2,2}$,triangle)-free graphs; it is open even for ($P_1 + 2P_2$,triangle)-free graphs. In a similar case, in [1], it was shown that the clique-width of (P_6,triangle)-free graphs is bounded, and in [13], it was shown that the clique-width of ($S_{1,1,3}$,triangle)-free graphs is bounded.

Based on [13] and [1], in this paper we show that ($S_{1,2,2}$,triangle)-free graphs have bounded clique-width. Thus, also the open problem for ($P_1 + 2P_2$,triangle)-free graphs is solved.

In [11], Lozin showed that the clique-width of bipartite $S_{1,2,3}$-free graphs is at most 5. Thus, we consider prime $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs containing an odd cycle.

2 $(S_{1,2,2},K_3)$-free graphs containing a C_5

Similarly as for (P_6, K_3)-free graphs (see [1]), the structural properties of $(S_{1,2,2},K_3)$-free graphs containing a C_5 are the basic ones for showing bounded clique-width.

2.1 Structural properties

Let C be a C_5 in G with vertices v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, v_5 and edges v_iv_{i+1} (index arithmetic modulo 5). A *k-vertex* of C, $k \in \{0, 1, \ldots, 5\}$, is a vertex $v \notin V(C)$ having exactly k neighbors in $V(C)$. Since G is triangle-free, C has no k-vertex for $k \geq 3$, and every 2-vertex of C has non-consecutive neighbors in C. Let N denote the set of 0-vertices of C, let I_i denote the set of 1-vertices of C being adjacent to v_i and let $I_{i,j}$ denote the set of 2-vertices of C being adjacent to v_i and v_j. Clearly, since G is triangle-free, I_i and $I_{i,j}$ are independent vertex sets.

Lemma 1 *For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$ we have:*

(i) $I_i①I_{i+1}$ *and* $I_i⓪I_{i+2}$.

(ii) $I_i①I_{i-1,i+1}$ *and* $I_i⓪I_{i,i+2} \cup I_{i-2,i}$.

(iii) $N⓪I_i$ *and* $N⓪I_{i,i+2}$ *and thus,* $N = \emptyset$.

(iv) $I_{i,i+2}⓪(I_{i+2,i+4} \cup I_{i-2,i})$.

Proof. *(i)*: Without loss of generality, let $x \in I_1$, $y \in I_2$ and $z \in I_3$. Since $\{x, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, y\}$ does not induce an $S_{1,2,2}$, we have $xy \in E$. Since $\{x, z, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_2\}$ does not induce an $S_{1,2,2}$, we have $xz \notin E$.

(ii): $I_i①I_{i-1,i+1}$: Without loss of generality, let $x \in I_1$, and $y \in I_{5,2}$. Since $\{x, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_4, y\}$ does not induce an $S_{1,2,2}$, we have $xy \in E$.

$I_i⓪I_{i,i+2} \cup I_{i-2,i}$: Holds since G is triangle-free.

(iii): Let $z \in N$, and without loss of generality, let $x \in I_1$, and $y \in I_{2,4}$. Since $\{z, x, v_1, v_2, v_3, v_5\}$ does not induce an $S_{1,2,2}$, we have $xz \notin E$, and since $\{z, y, v_4, v_5, v_1, v_3\}$ does not induce an $S_{1,2,2}$, we have $yz \notin E$. Thus, since G, as a prime graph, is connected, we have $N = \emptyset$.

(iv): Holds since G is triangle-free. □

Corollary 1 *For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$ we have:*

(i) I_i *can only be distinguished by vertices in* $I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-3,i-1}$.

(ii) $I_{i,i+2}$ *can only be distinguished by vertices in* $I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-1,i+1} \cup I_{i+3} \cup I_{i-1}$.

Let

$$I'_i := \{x \in I_i : x⓪I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-3,i-1}\}.$$

Since G is prime, we have $|I'_i| \leq 1$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$. Thus, by Proposition 2, from now on, we can assume that $I'_i = \emptyset$:

(A) For all $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$, every vertex in I_i has a neighbor in $I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-3,i-1}$.

Clearly, if $x \in I_{i+1,i+3}$ has a neighbor in I_i then, since G is triangle-free and by Lemma 1 (i), we have $x ⓪ I_{i-1}$.

Let

$$I'_{i,i+2} := \{x \in I_{i,i+2} : x ① I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-1,i+1} \text{ and } x ⓪ I_{i-1} \cup I_{i+3}\}.$$

Then obviously, $I'_{i,i+2} \cup \{v_{i+1}\}$ is a module. Since G is prime, we have $I'_{i,i+2} = \emptyset$. Thus, from now on, we can assume that

(B) every vertex in $I_{i,i+2}$ has either a non-neighbor in $I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i-1,i+1}$ or a neighbor in $I_{i+3} \cup I_{i-1}$.

A bipartite graph $B = (X, Y, E)$ is a *bipartite chain graph* if for every $x, x' \in X$, either $N_Y(x) \subseteq N_Y(x')$ or $N_Y(x') \subseteq N_Y(x)$. It is well known that B is a bipartite chain graph if and only if B is $2P_2$-free, and the clique-width of bipartite chain graphs is at most 3 (e.g., since bipartite chain graphs are distance hereditary and the clique-width of distance-hereditary graphs is at most 3 - see [8]).

Lemma 2 *For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$ we have:*

(i) *There is no independent triple x, y, z with $x \in I_i$, $y \in I_{i+1,i+3}$, and $z \in I_{i-3,i-1}$.*

(ii) *$G[I_i \cup I_{i+1,i+3}]$ ($G[I_i \cup I_{i-3,i-1}]$, respectively) is a bipartite chain graph.*

(iii) *$G[I_{i,i+2} \cup I_{i+1,i+3}]$ is a bipartite chain graph.*

(iv) *For each vertex $x \in I_{i,i+2}$ having a non-neighbor in $I_{i+1,i+3}$ (in $I_{i-1,i+1}$, respectively), we have $x ① I_{i-1,i+1}$ ($x ① I_{i+1,i+3}$, respectively). In particular, there is no independent triple $a \in I_{i,i+2}$, $b \in I_{i+1,i+3}$, and $c \in I_{i+2,i+4}$.*

(v) *For each vertex $x \in I_{i,i+2}$ having a neighbor in I_{i+3} (in I_{i-1}, respectively), we have $x ① I_{i+1,i+3}$ ($x ① I_{i-1,i+1}$, respectively) and $x ⓪ I_{i-1}$ ($x ⓪ I_{i+3}$, respectively).*

Proof. (i): Without loss of generality, let x, y, z be an independent triple with $x \in I_1$, $y \in I_{2,4}$ and $z \in I_{3,5}$. Then $\{y, v_2, v_1, v_5, z, x\}$ induces an $S_{1,2,2}$, which is a contradiction.

(ii): Without loss of generality, let $x, x' \in I_1$, and $y, y' \in I_{2,4}$, and suppose that $xy \in E$, $xy' \notin E$, $x'y \notin E$, and $x'y' \in E$. Then $\{x, y, v_4, y', x', v_5\}$ induces an $S_{1,2,2}$, which is a contradiction.

(iii): Without loss of generality, let $x, x' \in I_{1,3}$, and $y, y' \in I_{2,4}$, and suppose that $xy \in E$, $xy' \notin E$, $x'y \notin E$, and $x'y' \in E$. Then $\{x, y, v_4, y', x', v_5\}$ induces an $S_{1,2,2}$, which is a contradiction.

(iv): Without loss of generality, let $x \in I_{1,3}$ and $y \in I_{2,4}$ with $xy \notin E$. Suppose that there is a vertex $z \in S_{5,2}$ with $xz \notin E$. Then $\{x, v_3, v_4, v_5, z, y\}$ induces an $S_{1,2,2}$, which is a contradiction.

(v): Without loss of generality, let $x \in I_{1,3}$ and $y \in I_4$ with $xy \in E$. Suppose that there is a vertex $z \in I_{2,4}$ with $xz \notin E$. Then $\{x, y, v_4, z, v_2, v_5\}$ induces an $S_{1,2,2}$, which is a contradiction. The second condition holds since G is triangle-free and by Lemma 1 (i). □

2.2 3-chain graphs

Now, as a first step, we describe a generalization of bipartite chain graphs which is closely related to $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs:

$G = (V, E)$ is a 3-*chain graph* if V has a partition into three independent sets A, B, C such that $|A| = |B| = |C| = p$, say $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_p\}$, $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_p\}$, $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_p\}$, and

(i) Every pair of A, B, C induces a bipartite chain graph in G.

(ii) (a) For all $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, we have $N_B(a_i) = \{b_1, \ldots, b_i\}$, $N_C(a_i) = \{c_i, \ldots, c_p\}$, and
(b) for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, p-1\}$, we have $N_B(c_i) = \{b_{i+1}, \ldots, b_p\}$, and $N_B(c_p) = \emptyset$.

In particular, we have:

Every vertex in A has a neighbor in B and a neighbor in C.

Every vertex in B has a neighbor in A and a non-neighbor in C.

Every vertex in C has a neighbor in A and a non-neighbor in B.

Lemma 3 *The clique-width of* 3*-chain graphs is at most* 6*.*

Proof. Let $G = (V, E)$ be a 3-chain graph with $V = A \cup B \cup C$, $A = \{a_1, \ldots, a_p\}$, $B = \{b_1, \ldots, b_p\}$, $C = \{c_1, \ldots, c_p\}$, as defined above. We construct G as follows:

1. Create a_1 with label l_1, b_1 with label l_2, and c_1 with label l_3.
2. Join l_1 with l_2 and l_1 with l_3.
3. **For** $i := 2$ **to** p **do begin**
   (a) Create a_i with label l_4, b_i with label l_5, and c_i with label l_6.
   (b) Join l_4 with l_2, l_5, and l_6. Join l_1 with l_6 and l_5 with l_3.
   (c) Relabel l_4 to l_1, l_5 to l_2, and l_6 to l_3.

   end

□

3-chain graphs are closely related to $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs for the following reason:

Let

$X_i := \{v \in I_{i+1,i+3} : v \text{ has a neighbor in } I_i \text{ or a non-neighbor in } I_{i+2,i+4}\}$

$Y_i := \{v \in I_{i+2,i+4} : v \text{ has a neighbor in } I_i \text{ or a non-neighbor in } I_{i+1,i+3}\}$

$Z_i := \{v \in I_i : v \text{ has a neighbor in } I_{i+1,i+3} \cup I_{i+2,i+4}\}$

Let $H_i := G[X_i \cup Y_i \cup Z_i]$. By Lemmas 1 and 2, $V(G) \backslash V(C)$ can be partitioned into $X_1, \ldots, X_5$, $Y_1, \ldots, Y_5$, $Z_1, \ldots, Z_5$ such that for any i, j with $i \neq j$, H_i and H_j cannot distinguish each other.

Now we focus on the following typical case of H_1: As before, let $(v_1, ..., v_5)$ be a C_5 in G, let $Z = I_1$ denote the set of 1-vertices adjacent to v_1, and let $X = I_{2,4} = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$ ($Y = I_{3,5} = \{y_1, \ldots, y_k\}$, respectively) be the set of 2-vertices adjacent to v_2, v_4 (to v_3, v_5, respectively).

Clearly, by Lemma 2 (*iii*), $X \cup Y$ induce a bipartite chain graph. For each i, $1 \leq i \leq k$, let $N_Y(x_i) = \{y_1, \ldots, y_{i-1}\}$, and in particular, $N_Y(x_1) = \emptyset$.

Proposition 3 *If $zx_j \in E$ then $zx_i \in E$ for all $i \leq j$.*

Proof. Assume that $zx_j \in E$. Then, since G is triangle-free, $z⓪N_Y(x_j)$. Thus, by Lemma 2 (*i*), z is adjacent to every non-neighbor of any vertex in $N_Y(x_j)$, i.e., $zx_i \in E$ for all $i \leq j$. □

Let i_z be the maximum index for which z is adjacent to x_i. Thus, $N_X(z) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_{i_z}\}$, $y_1, \ldots, y_{i_z-1}$ are non-adjacent to z and $y_{i_z+1}, \ldots, y_k$ are adjacent to z.

In a 3-chain graph, $zy_{i_z} \notin E$ while in general, $zy_{i_z} \in E$ is possible. Thus, 3-chain graphs are a special case of induced subgraphs in the prime ($S_{1,2,2}$,K_3)-free graph containing a C_5.

Now we focus on more details.

2.3 Further properties when G contains a C_5

Claim 2.1 *If $I_{i-1,i+1} \neq \emptyset$ and $I_{i+1,i+3} \neq \emptyset$, then for each vertex $x \in I_{i,i+2}$ either $x①I_{i-1,i+1}$ or $x①I_{i+1,i+3}$.*

Proof. It follows by Lemma 2 (*iv*). □

Then by Claim 2.1, $I_{i,i+2}$ admits a partition $\{I^-_{i,i+2}, I^+_{i,i+2}, I^*_{i,i+2}\}$, where:

$I^-_{i,i+2} := \{x \in I_{i,i+2} : x \text{ has a non-neighbor in } I_{i+1,i+3}\}$,

$I^+_{i,i+2} := \{x \in I_{i,i+2} : x \text{ has a non-neighbor in } I_{i-1,i+1}\}$,

$I^*_{i,i+2} := I_{i,i+2} \setminus (I^-_{i,i+2} \cup I^+_{i,i+2})$.

Remark 1. Note that for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$, $I^-_{i,i+2}$ is non-empty only if $I_{i+1,i+3}$ is non-empty, and $I^+_{i,i+2}$ is non-empty only if $I_{i-1,i+1}$ is non-empty. □

Then by Lemma 2 (*ii*) and (*iv*), the following properties hold for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$:

On one hand we have:

$I^-_{i,i+2}①I_{i-1,i+1}$.

$I^+_{i,i+2}①I^+_{i-1,i+1} \cup I^*_{i-1,i+1}$.

$I^+_{i,i+2} \cup I^-_{i-1,i+1}$ induce a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

$I^*_{i,i+2}①I_{i-1,i+1}$.

On the other hand, by symmetry, we have:

$I^-_{i,i+2}①I^-_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^*_{i+1,i+3}$.

$I^-_{i,i+2} \cup I^+_{i+1,i+3}$ induce a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

$I^+_{i,i+2}①I_{i+1,i+3}$.

$I^*_{i,i+2}①I_{i+1,i+3}$.

Claim 2.2 *For every $i \in \{1,\dots,5\}$, we have $I_i⓪I^+_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^-_{i-3,i-1}$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that without loss of generality, there are $x \in I_1$ and $y \in I^+_{2,4}$ with $xy \in E$. Let $z \in I_{1,3}$ be a non-neighbor of y. Then x, y, z, v_3, v_1, v_5 induce an $S_{1,2,2}$ in G which is a contradiction. Thus, $I_i⓪I^+_{i+1,i+3}$. By symmetry, we also have $I_i⓪I^-_{i-3,i-1}$. □

Claim 2.3 *For each vertex $x \in I_i$, either $x⓪I^*_{i+1,i+3}$ or $x⓪I^*_{i-3,i-1}$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let $x \in I_1$. If neither $x⓪I^*_{2,4}$ nor $x⓪I^*_{3,5}$ then x together with neighbors $y \in I^*_{2,4}$ and $z \in I^*_{3,5}$ would induce a triangle in G which is a contradiction. □

Claim 2.4 *If a vertex $x \in I_i$ contacts $I^*_{i+1,i+3}$ (contacts $I^*_{i-3,i-1}$, respectively), then $x①I^-_{i+1,i+3}$ and $x⓪I_{i-3,i-1}$ ($x①I^+_{i-3,i-1}$ and $x⓪I_{i+1,i+3}$, respectively).*

Proof. Without loss of generality, assume that $x \in I_1$ contacts $I^*_{2,4}$, i.e., there is a vertex $y \in I^*_{2,4}$ with $xy \in E$.

First, suppose to the contrary that x has a non-neighbor $y' \in I^-_{2,4}$. Then y' has a non-neighbor $z \in I_{3,5}$. Since G is triangle-free and $xy \in E$ and $yz \in E$, we have $xz \notin E$ but then x, y', z is an independent triple which is a contradiction to Lemma 2 (i).

Second, since G is triangle-free, if x contacts $y \in I^*_{2,4}$ then x is non-adjacent to every vertex $z \in I_{3,5}$ since $xy \in E$ and $y①I_{3,5}$.

This shows: If a vertex $x \in I_i$ contacts $I^*_{i+1,i+3}$ then $x①I^-_{i+1,i+3}$ and $x⓪I_{i-3,i-1}$.

By symmetry, we have: If a vertex $x \in I_i$ contacts $I^*_{i-3,i-1}$ then $x①I^+_{i-3,i-1}$ and $x⓪I_{i+1,i+3}$. □

Let

$$I_i^{left} := \{x \in I_i : x \text{ contacts } I^*_{i+1,i+3},\ x①I^-_{i+1,i+3},\ x⓪I^+_{i+1,i+3}, \text{ and } x⓪I_{i-3,i-1}\},$$

$I_i^{right} := \{x \in I_i : x$ contacts $I^*_{i-3,i-1}$, $x①I^+_{i-3,i-1}$, $x⓪I^-_{i-3,i-1}$, and $x⓪I_{i+1,i+3}\}$,

$I_i^{both} := \{x \in I_i : x$ contacts $I^-_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^+_{i-3,i-1}$, and $x⓪I^+_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^*_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^-_{i-3,i-1} \cup I^*_{i-3,i-1}\}$.

Then by (A) and by Claims 2.2, 2.3, and 2.4, for every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$, I_i admits a partition into $\{I_i^{left}, I_i^{right}, I_i^{both}\}$.

As mentioned in Lemma 2 (v), we have:

Claim 2.5 *No vertex of $I^*_{i,i+2}$ contacts both I_{i-1}^{left} and I_{i+3}^{right}.*

Then $V(G) \setminus C$ can be partitioned into the following families of sets:

- $\mathcal{F}_1 := \{I^*_{i,i+2} \cup I_{i-1}^{left} \cup I_{i+3}^{right} : i = 1, \ldots, 5\}$,
- $\mathcal{F}_2 := \{I_i^{both} \cup I^-_{i+1,i+3} \cup I^+_{i-3,i-1} : i = 1, \ldots, 5\}$.

Lemma 4 *Each member of $\mathcal{F}_1$ induces a graph with bounded clique-width.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us consider the prime subgraph $G[I^*_{1,3} \cup I_4^{right} \cup I_5^{left}]$; in particular, it has no isolated vertices. Then by Claim 2.5, $I^*_{1,3}$ admits a partition $\{W, Z\}$, where: $W = \{x \in I^*_{1,3} : x$ contacts $I_4^{right}\}$ and $Z = \{x \in I^*_{1,3} : x$ contacts $I_5^{left}\}$. Let us recall that $I_4^{right}①I_5^{left}$ by Lemma 1 (i).

Then a k-expression for $G[I^*_{1,3} \cup I_4^{right} \cup I_5^{left}]$, with k bounded, may be defined as follows:

(1) construct an expression by a disjoint union of two *local* expressions as follows:

the first local expression describes $W \cup I_4^{right}$ as follows:

- (i) label the vertices of $W \cup I_4^{right}$ by a t-expression, with t bounded, since $G[W \cup I_4^{right}]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph by Lemma 2 (ii);
- (ii) RE-LABEL the labels of W by a label l_1, and RE-LABEL the labels of I_4^{right} by a label l_2;

the second local expression describes $Z \cup I_5^{left}$ as follows:

- (i) label the vertices of $Z \cup I_5^{left}$ by a t-expression, with t bounded, since $G[Z \cup I_5^{left}]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph by Lemma 2 (ii);
- (ii) RE-LABEL the labels of Z by a label l_3, and RE-LABEL the labels of I_5^{left} by a label l_4;

(2) JOIN l_2 with l_4.

By symmetry we can do it similarly for every $I^*_{i,i+2} \cup I_{i-1}^{left} \cup I_{i+3}^{right}$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, 5\}$. □

Lemma 5 *Each member of $\mathcal{F}_2$ induces a graph with bounded clique-width.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, let us consider the prime subgraph $G[I^-_{2,4} \cup I^+_{3,5} \cup I^{both}_1]$; in particular, it has no isolated vertices. Let $A = I^-_{2,4}$, $B = I^+_{3,5}$, $Z = I^{both}_1$. Furthermore let us assume that A, B, Z are non-empty, since otherwise $G[A \cup B \cup Z]$ is bipartite, i.e., $2P_2$-free bipartite by Lemma 2, and Lemma 5 directly follows.

We first consider $G[A \cup B]$. By Lemma 2 (iii), $G[A \cup B]$ is $2P_2$-free bipartite. Let $A_0 := \{x \in A : x⓪B\}$ and $B_0 := \{x \in B : x⓪A\}$. These sets might be empty; we assume without loss of generality that $A_0 \neq \emptyset$ and $B_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then

$$A_0⓪B \text{ and } B_0⓪A. \tag{1}$$

Moreover, assume without loss of generality that $A_0 \neq A$ and $B_0 \neq B$ (otherwise we can proceed as in Lemma 4).

Then, as one can easily prove, there is a partition $\{A_0, A_1, \ldots, A_p\}$ of A, and a partition $\{B_0, B_1, \ldots, B_p\}$ of B, with $A_i \neq \emptyset$ and $B_i \neq \emptyset$ for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$, $p \geq 1$, such that for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $h = p + 1 - i$, we have:

$$A_i⓪B_0 \cup \ldots \cup B_{h-1} \text{ and } A_i①B_h \cup \ldots \cup B_p. \tag{2}$$

$$B_i⓪A_0 \cup \ldots \cup A_{h-1} \text{ and } B_i①A_h \cup \ldots \cup A_p. \tag{3}$$

Now we consider $G[Z]$. By Lemma 2 (ii), $G[Z \cup A]$ is $2P_2$-free bipartite. Let

$Z^* := \{z \in Z : z \text{ does not contact } A\}$.

$Z_i := \{z \in Z : z \text{ contacts } A_i \text{ and } z⓪A_{i+1} \cup \ldots \cup A_p\}$, for $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$.

$Z_p := \{z \in Z : z \text{ contacts } A_p\}$.

Let us consider the following exhaustive cases.

Case 1. $Z^* = \emptyset$.

Thus, there is a partition $\{Z_0, Z_1, \ldots, Z_p\}$ of Z. We need the following properties:

$$\text{For each } i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \text{ we have } Z_i①A_0 \cup A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_{i-1}. \tag{4}$$

Proof. Let us just prove that $Z_i①A_{i-1}$, since the remaining cases can be similarly proved by (2). Suppose to the contrary that $z \in Z_i$ has a non-neighbor $a_{i-1} \in A_{i-1}$. By (2), we have: $A_i①B_h \cup B_{h+1}$, while $A_{i-1}⓪B_h$ and $A_{i-1}①B_{h+1}$. In particular, since G is triangle-free, z does not contact $B_h \cup B_{h+1}$. Then z, a_{i-1}, and any vertex of B_h form an independent triple which is a contradiction to Lemma 2 (i). □

$$\text{For each } i \in \{1, \ldots, p\} \text{ and } h = p + 1 - i \text{ we have } Z_i⓪B_h \cup \ldots \cup B_p. \tag{5}$$

Proof. It follows by (2) and since G is triangle-free. □

$$\text{For each } i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p\} \text{ and } h = p + 1 - i \text{ we have } Z_i①B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{h-2}. \tag{6}$$

Proof. By definition of Z_i, we have $Z_i⓪A_{i+1}$. By (1) and (2), $A_{i+1}⓪B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{h-2}$. Then by Lemma 2 (i), the assertion follows. □

Thus, for $i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p\}$, Z_i admits a partition $\{Z^-_i, Z^+_i\}$ where:

- $Z_i^- := \{z \in Z_i : z \text{ has a non-neighbor in } A_i\}$.
- $Z_i^+ := \{z \in Z_i : z ① A_i\}$.

$$\text{For each } i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p\} \text{ and } h = p + 1 - i \text{ we have } Z_i^- ① B_{h-1}. \tag{7}$$

Proof. By definition of Z_i^-, every $z \in Z_i^-$ has a non-neighbor in A_i. By (2), $A_i ⓪ B_{h-1}$. Then by Lemma 2 (i), the assertion follows. □

By definition of Z_i^+, we have:

$$\text{For each } i \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p\},\ Z_i^+ ① A_i. \tag{8}$$

Then by the above, by (4)-(8), and by Lemma 2 (ii), the following relations hold:

(R1)
- $Z_0^- ⓪ A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_p$,
- $Z_0^- ① B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_p$, and
- $G[Z_0^- \cup A_0]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

(R2)
- $Z_0^+ ⓪ A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_p$,
- $Z_0^+ ① A_0$, $Z_0^+ ① B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{p-1}$, and
- $G[Z_0^+ \cup B_p]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

(R3) For $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $h = p + 1 - i$, we have:
- $Z_i^- ⓪ A_{i+1} \cup \ldots \cup A_p$, $Z_i^- ⓪ B_h \cup \ldots \cup B_p$,
- $Z_i^- ① A_0 \cup A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_{i-1}$, $Z_i^- ① B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{h-1}$, and
- $G[Z_i^- \cup A_i]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

(R4) For $i \in \{1, \ldots, p\}$ and $h = p + 1 - i$, we have:
- $Z_i^+ ⓪ A_{i+1} \cup \ldots \cup A_p$, $Z_i^+ ⓪ B_h \cup \ldots \cup B_p$,
- $Z_i^+ ① A_0 \cup A_1 \cup \ldots \cup A_i$, $Z_i^+ ① B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{h-2}$, and
- $G[Z_i^+ \cup B_{h-1}]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph.

Then, by (R1)-(R4), a k-expression, with bounded k, may be defined as follows:

Comment: For simplicity let us indicate the labels by the following colors: *white*, *green*, *black*, *pale white*, *pale green*, *pale black*, *blue*. □

Procedure Labeling

begin

{*preliminary phase*}

:: create $A_0 \cup Z_0^-$ and label its vertices by a t-expression with t bounded ($A_0 \cup Z_0^-$ induces a $2P_2$-free bipartite graph);

:: RE-LABEL the labels of A_0 by *white*;

:: create $Z_0^+ \cup B_p$ and label its vertices by a t-expression with t bounded ($Z_0^+ \cup B_p$ induces a $2P_2$-free bipartite graph);

:: RE-LABEL the labels of B_p by *black*;

:: RE-LABEL the labels of Z_0^- by *pale green*;

:: JOIN *pale green* with *black*;

:: RE-LABEL *pale green* by *green*;

:: RE-LABEL the labels of Z_0^+ by *pale green*;

:: JOIN *pale green* with *white*;

:: RE-LABEL *pale green* by *green*;

{*main phase*}

:: **For** $k := 1$ **to** p **do**:

:::: **begin**

:::: create $A_k \cup Z_k^-$ and label its vertices by a t-expression with t bounded ($A_k \cup Z_k^-$ induces a $2P_2$-free bipartite graph);

:::: RE-LABEL the labels of A_k by *pale white*;

:::: JOIN *pale white* with *black*;

:::: create $Z_k^+ \cup B_{h-1}$ [where $h = p + 1 - k$] and label its vertices by a t-expression with t bounded ($Z_k^+ \cup B_{h-1}$ induces a $2P_2$-free bipartite graph);

:::: RE-LABEL the labels of B_{h-1} [where $h = p + 1 - k$] by *pale black*;

:::: JOIN *pale black* with *green*;

:::: RE-LABEL the labels of Z_k^- by *pale green*;

:::: JOIN *pale green* with *pale black*;

:::: JOIN *pale green* with *white*;

:::: RE-LABEL *pale green* by *green*;

:::: RE-LABEL the labels of Z_k^+ by *pale green*;

:::: JOIN *pale green* with *pale white*;

:::: JOIN *pale green* with *white*;

:::: RE-LABEL *pale green* by *green*;

:::: RE-LABEL *pale white* by *white*;

:::: RE-LABEL *pale black* by *black*;

:::: **end**;

:: **end**.

Case 2. $Z^* \neq \emptyset$.

This case can be treated similarly to Case 1 according to the following properties:

Proposition 4 *If $A_0 = \emptyset$, then $G[Z^* \cup B_p]$ is a $2P_2$-free bipartite subgraph, and $Z^* \textcircled{1} B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_{p-1}$.*

Proof. It follows by definition of Z^*, by (2)-(3), and by Lemma 2 (i). □

Proposition 5 *If $A_0 \neq \emptyset$, then $Z^* ① B_0 \cup B_1 \cup \ldots \cup B_p$.*

Proof. It follows by definition of Z^*, by (2)-(3), and by Lemma 2 (i). □

Assume that $A_0 = \emptyset$. Then $Z_0 = \emptyset$ as well. Then one can apply an approach similar to that of Case 1 by the following slight modifications in Procedure Labeling:

i) rewrite the *preliminary phase* as follows according to Proposition 4:

:: create $Z^* \cup B_p$ and label its vertices by a t-expression with t bounded ($Z^* \cup B_p$ induces a $2P_2$-free bipartite graph);

:: RE-LABEL the labels of Z^* by *blue*;

:: RE-LABEL the labels of B_p by *black*.

ii) add the following lines after the *main phase* according to Proposition 4:

:: JOIN *blue* with *black*.

Assume that $A_0 \neq \emptyset$. Then one can apply an approach similar to that of Case 1 by the following slight modifications in Procedure Labeling:

j) add the following lines after the *main phase* according to Proposition 5:

:: create Z^* and label its vertices by *blue*;

:: JOIN *blue* with *black*.

This completes the proof of Lemma 5. □

2.4 Bounded clique-width

Now we are able to show:

Theorem 1 *$(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs containing a C_5 have bounded clique-width.*

Proof. Since C has only five vertices, we can restrict to $G[V(G) \setminus V(C)]$ by Proposition 2, i.e., $V(G) \setminus V(C)$ can be partitioned into the families F_1 and F_2 of vertex subsets as defined above. Let us say that the *sides* of a member H of F_1 (or of F_2) are the sets whose union defines H. For example the sides of $I^*_{i,i+2} \cup I^{right}_{i-2} \cup I^{left}_{i-1}$ are $I^*_{i,i+2}, I^{right}_{i-2}$, and I^{left}_{i-1}. Then by Lemmas 1 and 2, by definitions, and by Claims 2.2 and 2.4, we have:

$(*)$ For any side S of any member H of $F_1 \cup F_2$ and for any side T of any member K of $F_1 \cup F_2$ with $K \neq H$, either $S ① T$ or $S ⓪ T$.

Note that $F_1 \cup F_2$ has 10 members and 30 sides. Then let L be a set of labels, with $|L| = 30$, such that each label of L is associated to a side of a member of $F_1 \cup F_2$. Then a k-expression for G, with k bounded, may be defined as follows:

(1) construct an expression by a DISJOINT UNION of 10 *local* expressions; each local expression describes a member H of $F_1 \cup F_2$ as follows:

   (i) label the vertices of H by a t-expression, with t bounded, according to Lemmas 4 and 5;

   (ii) for each side S of H, RE-LABEL the labels of S, by the label of L associated to S;

(2) for each pair (l_1, l_2) of labels of L, possibly JOIN l_1 with l_2, according to $(*)$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1. □

3 $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3, C_5)$-free graphs containing an odd cycle

Now first assume that the prime $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graph G is C_5-free but contains a C_7, say C with vertex set $\{v_1, \ldots, v_7\}$ and edges $v_i v_{i+1}$ (index arithmetic modulo 7).

Let Z denote the set of 0-vertices of C. Let $I_{i,i+2}$ denote the 2-vertices being adjacent to v_i and v_{i+2}.

Then we have:

Lemma 6 *For every $i \in \{1, \ldots, 7\}$ we have:*

(i) *There are no i-vertices of C for $i \in \{1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7\}$.*

(ii) *The only 2-vertices are the ones in $I_{i,i+2}$.*

(iii) $Z \textcircled{0} I_{i,i+2}$.

(iv) $Z = \emptyset$.

(v) $I_{i,i+2} \textcircled{0} I_{i+2,i+4} \cup I_{i+3,i+5}$.

(vi) $I_{i,i+2} \textcircled{1} I_{i+1,i+3}$.

(vii) $I_{i,i+2} = \emptyset$.

Proof. (i) and (ii): Obvious since G is $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3, C_5)$-free.

(iii): If $z \in Z$ sees $x \in I_{1,3}$ then z would be a 1-vertex for the C_7 induced by $\{v_1, \ldots, v_7\} \cup \{x\} \setminus \{v_2\}$ which is a contradiction to (i).

(iv): Since G, as a prime graph, is connected, (iii) implies (iv).

(v): Obvious since G is (K_3, C_5)-free.

(vi): If there are $x \in I_{1,3}$ and $y \in I_{2,4}$ with $xy \notin E$ then x, v_3, v_4, v_5, v_6, y induce an $S_{1,2,2}$ which is a contradiction.

(vii): Obviously follows from (v) and (vi). □

Corollary 2 *If the prime $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3, C_5)$-free graph G contains a C_7 then it is isomorphic to C_7.*

Finally assume that the prime $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graph G is $(C_5, C_7, \ldots, C_{2k-1})$-free but contains a C_{2k+1}, $k \geq 4$.

Now, the following is easy to see (by using similar arguments as in Lemma 6):

Corollary 3 *If the prime $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graph G is C_{2i-1}-free for every $i \leq k$ but contains a C_{2k+1} then it is isomorphic to C_{2k+1}.*

Thus we finally have:

Theorem 2 *$(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs have bounded clique-width.*

In particular, Maximum Weight Independent Set (MWIS) and various other NP-complete problems can be solved in polynomial or even in linear time for $(S_{1,2,2}, K_3)$-free graphs [3]. In [10], MWIS is solved in polynomial time for the superclass of ($S_{1,2,2}$,bull)-free graphs.

Acknowledgment. We thank Daniël Paulusma for recently informing us that Theorem 2 was shown already in [5].

Open Problem. Do $(S_{1,2,3}, K_3)$-free graphs have bounded clique-width?

References

[1] A. Brandstädt, T. Klembt, and S. Mahfud, P_6- and Triangle-Free Graphs Revisited: Structure and Bounded Clique-Width, *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* 8(1) (2006) 173-188.

[2] B. Courcelle, J. Engelfriet, and G. Rozenberg, Handle-rewriting hypergraph grammars, *J. Comput. Syst. Sciences*, 46 (1993) 218-270.

[3] B. Courcelle, J.A. Makowsky, and U. Rotics, Linear time solvable optimization problems on graphs of bounded clique width, *Theory of Computing Systems* 33 (2000) 125-150.

[4] B. Courcelle, and S. Olariu, Upper bounds to the clique width of graphs, *Discrete Applied Math.* 101 (2000) 77-114.

[5] K.K. Dabrowski, F. Dross and D. Paulusma, Narrowing the gap in the clique-width dichotomy for (H_1, H_2)-free graphs, CoRR arXiv:1512.07849v1, 2015

[6] K.K. Dabrowski and D. Paulusma, Clique-width of Graph Classes Defined by Two Forbidden Induced Subgraphs, *Comput. J.* 59 (2016) 650-666.

[7] K.K. Dabrowski and D. Paulusma, Classifying the clique-width of H-free bipartite graphs, *Discrete Applied Math.* 200 (2016) 43-51.

[8] M.C. Golumbic, and U. Rotics, On the Clique-Width of Some Perfect Graph Classes, *Internat. J. Foundations of Computer Science* 11 (2000) 423-443.

[9] M. Kaminski, V.V. Lozin, and M. Milanič, Recent developments on graphs of bounded clique-width, *Discrete Applied Math.* 157 (2009) 2747-2761.

[10] T. Karthick and F. Maffray, Maximum weight independent sets in classes related to claw-free graphs, *Discrete Applied Math.*, in press.

[11] V.V. Lozin, Bipartite graphs without a skew star, *Discrete Math.* 257 (2002) 83-100.

[12] V.V. Lozin and D. Rautenbach, On the band-, tree- and clique-width of graphs with bounded vertex degree, *SIAM J. on Discrete Math.* 18 (2004) 195-206.

[13] S. Mahfud, Effiziente Algorithmen zur Bestimmung der Unabhängigkeitszahl in Graphen, Ph.D. Thesis (Dissertation), University of Rostock, 2005.